DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 452 733 FL 026 706

AUTHOR	Nickisch, Craig W., Ed.
TITLE	Selecta: The Journal of the Pacific Northwest Council for Languages, 1999.
INSTITUTION	Pacific Northwest Council for Languages.
ISSN	ISSN-0277-0598
PUB DATE	1999-00-00
NOTE	27p.
AVAILABLE FROM	PNCFL, c/o Yamada Language Center, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-1236. Web site: http://www.usd.edu/selecta/.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022)
LANGUAGE	English, German
JOURNAL CIT	SELECTA: Journal of the Pacific Northwest Council for Languages; v20 1999
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Classical Literature; *French Literature; *German Literature; *Literature Appreciation; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning

ABSTRACT

This issue contains three articles, one each in the area of classical, French, and German literature respectively: "Treatments of 'Furor' and 'Ira' and the End of Vergil's 'Aeneid'" (James M. Scott); "Ambiguity and Binarism in Georges Feydeau's 'La Puce a l'oreille'" (James Mills); and, in German, "Die Fahne hoch! Das Horst-Wessel Lied als Nationalhymne" (Craig W. Nickisch). Scholarly references are appended to the end of each article. (Contains 75 references.)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 452 733

SELECTA

Volume 20
1999

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

Craig W. Nickisch

1

Pacific Northwest Council for Languages

FL 026706

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SELECTA

Volume 20
1999

Edited by
Craig W. Nickisch
Idaho State University

Pacific Northwest Council for Languages

SELECTA

Volume 20, 1999

SELECTA is a publication of the Pacific Northwest Council for Languages, a non-profit organization of language professionals. Correspondence may be addressed to: PNCFL, c/o Yamada Language Center, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-1236.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CLASSICAL LITERATURE

Treatments of *Furor* and *Ira* and the End of Vergil's A*eneid* 1
James M. Scott

FRENCH LITERATURE

Ambiguity and Binarism in Georges Feydeau's *La Puce à l'oreille* 9
James Mills

THE EDITOR'S PAGE 16

GERMAN LITERATURE

"Die Fahne hoch!" *Das Horst-Wessel-Lied* als Nationalhymne 17
Craig W. Nickisch

ISSN 0277-0598

Copyright © 1999, Pacific Northwest Council for Languages

Treatments of *Furor* and *Ira* and the End of Vergil's *Aeneid*

James M. Scott
The University of Montana

Throughout Vergil's *Aeneid* and particularly at the end of the epic, Aeneas' emotions - and his consequent actions - have confused readers. Regardless of one's interpretive position, Aeneas has generally been looked upon as a hero who matures throughout the epic in the knowledge of his mission, which in part depends upon the hero's development of restraint, selflessness, and a sense of duty. When, however, in the last three books Aeneas appears "to regress" through his maniacal battle rage and slaughter of suppliants, the reader must question Vergil's intention.Specifically the final lines of the *Aeneid* arrest the reader. Up to this point Aeneas has been, with a few notable exceptions, single minded in executing his mission: to colonize Italy with his exiled Trojans, who will lay the foundation for the Roman Empire in a thousand years to come. The climax is reached when the arch antagonist, Turnus, who also is betrothed to the native princess, faces off with Aeneas in a conclusive, one on one battle. First pinned to the ground by Aeneas' spear, Turnus then supplicates Aeneas by admitting defeat, waiving any right to mercy, requesting his body to be returned to his father, ceding his betrothed to Aeneas, and praying for peace between the native Italians and the invading Trojan exiles. (XII. 931-38) This is all very compelling, and it appears that Aeneas will be moved to concession. Then suddenly kindled with rage and anger (*furiis accensus et ira / terribilis* (946-7)) at the sight of a fallen comrade's baldric stripped and worn by Turnus, Aeneas fiercely and vengefully plunges his sword into Turnus, whose resentful spirit (*vita ... indignata*) flees to the Shades below (952). Thus ends the *Aeneid*. How, then, should one construe Vergil's final representation of Aeneas?

In the past century the subject of Aeneas' use of *ira* ("anger") and *furor* ("rage") has received abundant and diverse attention. In general scholars have tried to understand Aeneas' passionate outbursts within the broader ethical and political contexts of the *Aeneid*. The intention of this article is to examine the various treatments of Aeneas' anger and wrath and to arrive at some classification of approach and analysis of scholarly opinion. Scholars have approached the subject of Aeneas' *ira* and *furor* in three general ways: first, the hero's *ira* and *furor* being or not being within the limits of orthodox Stoic ethics; second, his *ira* and *furor* as some consequence of his character development; and third, these passions making some statement about the meaning of the poem's ending. Only in the third area is there a scholarly consensus.

Whether or not Aeneas is a Stoic hero - and particularly in view of his anger and fury in the end of the epic - is a subject of considerable and multifarious attention. At issue here are Stoicism's cardinal tenets concerning fate and passion. Because of Stoicism's cosmic determinism, one must avoid any passion, such as fear and anger, that thwarts his acceptance of fate. In fact, a Stoic's duty is to understand and yield to fate through his actions. At the turn of the century Heinze and others began viewing Aeneas in more or less Stoic terms and especially so with regard to Aeneas' obedience to fate.[1]

However, it was not until Bowra's article in 1933 that Aeneas was almost completely identified as being Stoic.[2] Bowra argues that Aeneas struggles with three of the four Stoic cardinal virtues, but by the time he reaches Italy he has become fully stoicized. As for the passions of *ira* and *furor*, Bowra says that anger was a legitimate passion in Augustan Stoicism and that Aeneas in his martial wrath was Stoic as Augustan Rome understood it.[3]

Bowra's assessment of Aeneas remained prominent for the next forty years. Almost all articles in the following few decades agreed that Aeneas was Stoic, and the problem of his violence in books X and XII was ignored. Scholars of this period found Stoicism to be the unifying creed of the *Aeneid* and necessarily had to fit Aeneas into the prescribed ethics.[4] Similar to Bowra's approach, R. P. Bond has examined Aeneas in terms of the four cardinal virtues throughout the first six books and concludes that Aeneas is Stoic, though Bond does not deal with the matter of *ira* at the end of the poem.[5] Otis speaks of the necessity of Aeneas' *furor* insofar as fulfilling the *fatum-furor-pietas* complex that a Stoic circumstance may require; however, he does not make any particular judgment on Aeneas as an orthodox Stoic at the end of the *Aeneid*.[6] John Wilson provides an interesting twist to the thusfar conventional view of Aeneas' Stoicism. He sees Aeneas as Stoic, but thinks that the separation of action and feeling has rendered Aeneas the only unredeemed character in the poem, as his inconclusive *humanitas* yields to *ira* in Book XII.[7] C. J. Mackie studies the characterization of Aeneas through the dual and often opposing perspectives of *pietas* and *humanitas*. Though he barely mentions "Stoicism" as such, Mackie concludes that Aeneas' *pietas* triumphs in the final scene, since "only by killing Turnus ... can Aeneas, by furthering the progress of fate, be described as pius."[8] In the death scene of Mezentius, Mackie calls Aeneas' behavior *pius furor*, "because his (Aeneas') actions align themselves with fate."[9] This reading seems to be orthodox Stoicism and an indulgence for passionate response.

Bowra's contention that Aeneas is a Stoic - even in his state of *ira* and *furor* - did not go unchallenged in the past thirty years. Quinn, for example, says, "If it is true that the view of anger as a legitimate passion was part of the Augustan ideal, Virgil's narrative seems to me to challenge that view, not endorse it."[10] Quinn also asserts that the Augustans openly deviated from orthodox Stoicism on the issue of *ira*, that Vergil rejects this Augustan view, and that Aeneas has not done a defensible thing at the end of the poem.[11] D. A. Little also argues that Bowra has little evidence for claiming the legitimacy of anger, especially in Book XII.[12] Pöschl rejects Aeneas as a Stoic, though Pöschl does not deal with the matter of *ira* and Stoicism in Book XII. Mark Edwards and Pöschl find common ground in two important areas. First, both hint that strong passions - including *ira* - cannot be condoned by strict Stoicism but are perhaps acceptable to Panaetius' Middle Stoicism where impulses of human nature do have a proper place alongside universal nature, or fate.[13] Second, both Edwards and Pöschl maintain that Aeneas cannot be regarded as a Stoic, that this was not even possible or desirable for Vergil to make him so, since Stoic, Augustan, and Vergilian qualities cannot be combined into a unified and consistent character.[14] Both say that Aeneas is an amalgamation of several traits, and this is

what Pöschl means when he says that philosophy destroys art.[15] Galinsky too thinks that the *Aeneid* cannot be limited to one philosophical perspective, and in his study of *ira* finds that Aeneas' actions are compatible with Platonic, Aristotelian, and Epicurean notions of anger,[16] though in the following year Putnam critiques and rejects this argument.[17]

A second approach taken in examining the *ira* and *furor* of Aeneas is to view his passions in terms of his character development. Since this treatment is the most varied and individual, only an outline of the scholarly activity can be presented here. Within this category the major division is between those who feel that Aeneas' character matures throughout the *Aeneid* and those who feel that Aeneas is much the same at the end of Book XII as he was in the beginning of the poem.[18] To whatever side of this dichotomy one belongs, it is usually necessary to deal with the question of Aeneas' wrath. Those believing that he has matured throughout the epic must, of course, account for his passionate outbursts. For those who maintain that Aeneas has not developed - or at least in a positive way - Aeneas' final scene with Turnus provides much support.[19]

Various approaches have been taken to account for Aeneas' *ira* and still to defend his maturation. Justifications for Aeneas' wrath in killing Turnus include viewing Aeneas' behavior as only a temporary loss of control, not as a pervasive trait of character.[20] Others maintain that Aeneas' final actions are part of his *pietas* and that Turnus, as an embodiment of evil or an impediment to *fatum*, must be eliminated.[21] Still others assert that Aeneas' actions are defensible because he is a new type of hero, an Alexandrian hero based on Apollonius' Jason,[22] or because Aeneas is a more primitive Roman hero, one that must have a strong strain of savagery to satisfy the Roman taste.[23] Related to this requirement for savagery on aesthetic grounds is the belief also that one needs *ira* simply to kill and to be victorious[24] or that anger is a mature emotion in contrast to hatred and hostility.[25]

Aeneas' fury is also justified by the alleged difference between the words *furor* and *furiae*, since the latter, which is used in XII.946, does not necessarily have a negative quality about it.[26] But Putnam's analysis of *furor* finds no such distinction, and only in the case of Mezentius are words of anger justified by Stoic ethics.[27] In his commentary on Book X Harrison concedes that there has been a "great cost" in the founding of Rome, but he continues to say that "there can be no suggestion that it was not worthwhile or glorious"; and he adds, "For such a poem to be in any way 'anti-Augustan' would be extraordinary."[28] It has also been suggested that the very fact that Aeneas hesitates and pities Turnus is sufficient cause for his subsequent action.[29] Furthermore, there are the more conventional attitudes of those who feel that Pallas' death justifies the slaying of Turnus[30] and that *ira* and Turnus' death are not only necessary for the advancement of the Empire but are also consistent with Aeneas' selflessness.[31] Anderson sees Aeneas' final violence as the tragic conclusion to one who has struggled with his *pietas* and lost, thus developing as an active rather than passive character.[32] Hall, discussing the original ending of the Aeneas story, says that in Vergil's narrative "Too much had he (Aeneas) become the person of Augustus Caesar to be portrayed otherwise."[33] Summarizing what becomes

something of a compromise position. Nethercut, who has surveyed broadly American Vergilian scholarship of the current century, says "... we have come to grant Aeneas all the lack of discipline, all the ungovernable frenzy, that any 'real' man does have, only to feel uncomfortable about it."[34]

Scholars who maintain that Aeneas' *ira* and *furor* are unwarranted and indefensible see Aeneas' wrath as a statement about the meaning of the *Aeneid*. Following is a survey of the scholarly opinion that treats Aeneas' anger in Book XII as Vergil's comment on *res Romanae* and on the world in general. When Aeneas' anger is discussed in terms of the meaning of the *Aeneid*, the interpretation is usually negative. However, before these pessimistic views are outlined, there is one rather popular and somewhat positive interpretation to be mentioned. Several speak of Aeneas' wrath and the destruction in its wake as not being good in themselves, but acceptable on the grounds that a greater good - meaning the Empire - is a consequence.[35] This same theme of relative values is expressed by others in a more negative way. For example, Clausen and Beare see Aeneas' fury in Book XII as a criticism of the price and means of Augustus' success;[36] and Putnam too views the progress of the Empire as an achievement through madness, vengeance, and death.[37] Aeneas' final behavior reflects negatively in other ways upon the Empire. Several think that Aeneas is diminishing some sort of imperial standard of conduct or Augustan ideal.[38] Poe, Hanson, and Fowler even state that Aeneas' actions hint ominously at Rome's future.[39]

Thus far the remarks on Aeneas' fury and the meaning of the *Aeneid* have focused upon Augustus, the Empire, and Aeneas himself. That the behavior and circumstances of Aeneas make a more universal comment on the existential situation of man is equally common.[40] Many scholars have commented that Vergil sees the world as imperfect, a place where the uncertain and irrational have domain, and where the cosmic forces are at best impartial to the good man.[41] Thus much of what makes Aeneas tragic is frequently interpreted as Vergil's statement of the human condition. Moreover, the ending of the *Aeneid* has also been seen as Vergil's view of the balance of anger and goodness in the world: that *ira* is so pervasive in civilization that the effect of *pietas* more or less will be defeated.[42] Mackie's gloomy conclusion is that even with the fulfilment of Aeneas' *pietas*, "Vergil causes us to confront the inhumanity of the universe in which the *Aeneid* takes place."[43]

Finally there is one other observation in defense of Vergil's handling of the poem's ending. Tracy and Galinsky both say that perhaps Vergil had to have Aeneas kill Turnus, and in that very manner, since Vergil was working with an Aeneas-Turnus tradition that could not be radically altered for his contemporary audience.[44] Farron may also have this possible problem in mind when he points out that the ending of the *Aeneid* must have been extremely abrupt and jarring even to Vergil's audience.[45] He continues to say that no other Greek or Roman work ends so violently with no time allowed by the author for some kind of resolution or reconciliation, such as there is in the final books of the Homeric epics. So again the suggestion exists that Vergil may have found himself severely limited in the conclusion of the Aeneas-Turnus story.

Although the problems of Aeneas' passions of anger and the killing of Turnus

have received abundant and varied attention, I have tried to organize into a tri-partition the scholarly interpretation of these issues. One treatment questions the orthodoxy of Aeneas' Stoic ethics, with opinion equally divided. A second treatment looks at Aeneas' actions in terms of a maturing process - or a lack of it - throughout the epic. Again, neither opinion prevails. And thirdly, much has been discussed on Aeneas' final actions and disposition in terms of the poem's ending. In this category there is a consensus. Aeneas' wrath is variously, but almost unanimously, judged as a negative comment either upon Augustan ideals and progress or upon the state of the world as a whole and man's place in it. Even when the minority view maintains that the progress of the Empire is the greater good, it is nevertheless admitted that Aeneas' fury is a considerable price.

Thus the *Aeneid* has something of a non-ending to it. Gransden in his *Vergil's Aeneid* thinks this non-ending is consistent with the epic's theme of *imperium sine fine*; and for this thematic reason perhaps the epic should have no ending at all.[46] Quint sees the poem as a sequence "that follows the progress of Rome's history" and Turnus' death reflects an imperial, sanctioned vengeance to bring about an end in Rome's "national repetition compulsion." But Quint says "It is impossible, however, to know where the poet's own convictions leave off and where the party line begins."[47] And so, is there really an end to Augustan violence and to the epic? As for Vergil's deliberate silence on this, Gransden also cleverly points out that the last words one hears from Vergil in Dante's *Purgatorio* (Canto 27.139) are: "Expect no more signs from me ... you are free to choose."[48]

NOTES

1. Richard Heinze. *Virgils Epische Technik*. (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1915) 293-299. A. Cartault. *L'art de Virgile dans l'Eneide*. (Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1926) vol. 2, 864. For a list of early opinions on Aeneas' character, see George Howe, "The Development of the Character of Aeneas," *CJ* 26, 1930-31, 183. For a list of similar positions in the middle of this century, see R. P. Bond, "Aeneas and the Cardinal Virtures," *Prudentia*, 1974, 67 nn.2-7. Although there is no explicit mention of Stoicism, Harrison's chapter gives a useful survey of scholarship on the *Aeneid* for the past century. The author organizes the epic's interpretations according to the "Harvard School" and various national positions (S. J. Harrison. "Some Views of the *Aeneid* in the Twentieth Century," *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid* (S. J. Harrison, editor). (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990) 1-20.

2. C. M. Bowra, "Aeneas and the Stoic Ideal," *Greece and Rome*, 1933-34, 8-21. Although I have introduced all scholarship pertinent to this article's focus and scope, nevertheless the entire bibliography of Vergilian scholarship of the twentieth century through 1960 can be found in the following: Giuliano Mambelli. *Gli studi virgiliani nel secolo XX* . (Firenze: Sansoni, 1940). M. T. Morano Rando. *Bibliografia virgiliana 1937-1960*. (Genova: La Quercia Edizioni, 1987). It is remarkable that Mambelli's bibliography, which catalogues nearly 4000 published works on Vergil between 1900-1936, contains only a handful of works that question Aeneas' passions as acceptable or deals with the very ending of the poem (*cf.* n.1 *supra*). It is important to point out that the bibliographical citations do not necessary represent the works' pervasive argument. Often I have excerpted out of context passages in which the author makes specific reference to Aeneas' passions.

3. Bowra, 16-18.

4. R. Allain, "Quelques aspects de l'unité de l'Eneide," *LEC* 14, 1946, 151-173. N. W. DeWitt, "Virgil, Augustus, and Epicureanism," *CW* 35, 1941-42, 281-282. Gilbert Highet. *The Speeches in Vergil's Aeneid* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1972) 43. For additional opinions on this subject within this period, see Bond, 69 n.18.

5. Bond, 70-81. J. William Hunt. *Forms of Glory: Structure and Sense in the Aeneid* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois P, 1973) 72.

6. Brooks Otis. *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1966) 220.

7. J. R. Wilson, "Action and Emotion in Aeneas," *Greece and Rome* 16, 1969, 75. Somewhat

different in perspective but perhaps similar in result is the work of O'Hara, who sees a dichotomy between Aeneas' actions and his accurate understanding of present and future events. If the hero is not acting upon acquired knowledge - indeed, if he is being deceived by the gods - , perhaps the argument could be made that Aeneas is not Stoic (James J. O'Hara. *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid*. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1990) 120-122.)

8. C. J. Mackie. *The Characterization of Aeneas* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1988) 215. Although he does not discuss the qualifications of being Stoic, Hardie's explanation of Aeneas' impulse to kill Turnus as "pre-scripted on the divine level" agrees with a Stoic reading of Aeneas' behavior ("Virgil and Tragedy," *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (Charles Martindale, ed.). (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997) 314-315.

9. Mackie, 212.

10. Kenneth Quinn. *Virgil's Aeneid*. (Ann Arbor, MI: U of Michigan P, 1968) 18 n.2.

11. Quinn, 276.

12. D. A. Little, "Death of Turnus and the Pessimism of the Aeneid," *AUMLA* 33, 1970, 67. *Cf.* William S. Bonds, who also says that Vergil's use of anger is not Stoic (*Joy and Desire in the Aeneid*. (diss.: University of Pennsylvania, 1978).

13. Viktor Pöschl. *The Art of Vergil* (translated by Gerda Seligson). (Ann Arbor, MI: U of Michigan P, 1962) 54. Mark Edwards, "Expression of Stoic Ideas in the Aeneid," *Phoenix* 14, 1960, 158. Thornton thinks that Vergil's views on anger are Aristotelian or perhaps Platonic, but not Stoic, because she thinks anger plays a positive role in fighting and in responding to injustice in the *Aeneid* (*The Living Universe: Gods and Men in Virgil's Aeneid*. (Leiden: Brill, 1977) 159-160). Jackson-Knight believes Aeneas' emotional life to be "in harmony with the broad, cultured, sensitive, and sympathetic epicureanism of Siro's Garden" (*Roman Vergil*. (Middlesex, Eng.: Penguin, 1966) 395).

14. Pöschl, 57; Edwards, 164-165; Nicholas Horsfall. *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*. (Leiden: Brill, 1995) 197.

15. Pöschl, 57; Edwards, 161-162, nn. 34, 38; Wilson, 73-75.

16. Karl Galinsky, "The Anger of Aeneas," *AJPh* 109,1988, 321-348. Quoting Servius, Braun too says "To assign crude labels (meaning philosophical affiliations) to this most complex of authors is of limited usefulness" (Susanna Morton Braun. "Virgil and the Cosmos: Religious and Philosophical Ideas," *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*. 206-207). See also Horsfall (198-199).

17. Michael C. J. Putnam, "Anger, Blindness and Insight in Virgil's *Aeneid*," *Apeiron* 23 (4), 1990, 10-15.

18. For a survey of this position see Gary Miles, "Glorious Peace: The Values and Motivations of Virgil's *Aeneid*," *California Studies in Classical Antiquities* 9, 1977, 133, n.2. See also George Howe ("The Development of the Character of Aeneas," *CJ* 26, 1930-31, 183-184), who discusses Heinze's and other early 20th century scholars' positions on Aeneas' maturation. Cartault, 864; Bowra, 12-16; Pierre Boyancé. *La Religion de Virgile* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963) 76. John Hritzu. "A New and Broader Interpretation of the Ideality of Aeneas," *CW* 39, 1946, 99-101. Gunnar Carlsson, "The Hero and Fate in Virgil's Aeneid," *Eranos* 43, 1945, 134. Otis, 223; Quinn, 271-276; Michael Putnam. *The Poetry of the Aeneid*. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1966) 103, 152, 193. R. A. Hornsby. *Patterns of Action in the Aeneid*. (Iowa City, IA: U of Iowa P, 1970) 74-76. W. R. Johnson, "Aeneas and the Ironies of *Pietas*," *CJ* 60, 1965, 360-363. For the other side of this issue see Pöschl, 58-59; H. Liebing. *Die Aeneasgestalt bei Vergil* (Kiel: 1953); John Hanson, "Aeneas," *Eight Essays in Classical Humanities* (G. S. Schwartz, ed.). (Milburn, N.J.: R. F. Publishing, 1975), 67. Therese Fuhrer, "Aeneas: A Study in Character Development," *G & R* 36 (1989), 63-72.

19. See especially A. J. Boyle, "The Meaning of the Aeneid," *Ramus*, 1972, 63-90. S. Farron, "The Furor and Violentia of Aeneas," *AClass* 20, 1977, 204-08. John Wilson, 67-75; D. A. Little, 67-76.

20. M. Owen Lee. *Fathers and Sons in Vergil's Aeneid*. (Albany, NY: State U of NY P, 1979) 140-142. W. R. Johnson, "Aeneas," 360-362; *Darkness Visible*. (Berkeley, CA: U of California P, 1976) 116. Quinn, 273-276.

21. Otis, 218, 233, 246, 380; Gordon Williams. *Techniques and Ideas in the Aeneid*. (New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1983) 106. Karl Galinsky, ed., "The Originality of Roman Poetry," *Perspectives of Roman Poetry*, (from a panel discussion February 16, 1972). Austin, TX: U of Texas P, 1974, 134. Joe Park Poe, "Success and Failure in the Mission of Aeneas," *TAPA* 96, 1965, 323. A. H. Thornton, "The Last Scene of the Aeneid," *G & R*, 1953, 83-84. R. Johnson, "Aeneas," 363. W. Gransden. *Virgil's Iliad*. (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984), 211. Hritzu, 108; Boyle, 64-65. See also Schmidt, who speaks of the scholarly tendency to see Aeneas' actions as "eine Verpflichtung zur Rache oder zum Strafvollzug an dem "Verbrecher" Turnus aufzeigen ..."(97) (Jens-Uwe Schmidt. "Junos Versöhnung durch Jupiter und das Ende der Aeneis," *Wort und Dienst Jahrbuch der Theologischen Schule Bethel*. 21, 1991, 81-113).

22. W. W. DeGrummond, "Aeneas Despairing," *Hermes*, 1977, 227-231.

23. Bowra, 21; Galinsky, 134; Poe, 331-332; Gransden, 211; M. C. Bowra. *From Virgil to Milton* (London, 1962) 21. Charles Brooks, "The Heroic Impulse in the Odyssey," *CW* 70, 1977, 455; Quinn, 6.

24. Gordon Williams, 105, 222; Bowra, *From Virgil*, 69; Poe, 331; W. F. Jackson-Knight. *Roman Vergil*. (London: Faber and Faber, 1944) 142-143; D. J. Leigh, "Aeneas: True Man of True Emotion," *CB* 35, 1958-59, 68. Hardie thinks *furor* is necessary to reveal Aeneas' interior struggle and to avoid inertia (Philip R. Hardie. *Vergil's Aeneid. Cosmos and Imperium*. (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986) 135. Horsfall speaks about "traditional Roman values" and the expectation that Aeneas is supposed to be fierce as a result of his Trojan War experience (199-203).

25. Galinsky, "The Anger," 321-322. Haffa says that Aeneas acts within "the bounds of imperial Roman values" and also justifies Aeneas's killing Turnus "because it reflects the practice of Caesar toward the Gauls" (Alan J. M. Haffa. *The Cultural Poetics of Supplication in Epic*. (diss.: University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1996) 171-173).

26. F. Cairns. *Virgil's Augustan Epic* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989) 82-84. See Richard F. Thomas' critique of this issue ("*Furor* and *Furiae* in Virgil," *AJP* 112, 1991, 261), in which he and others, whom he cites, debunk this distinction as clear and significant. Though not making a linguistic distinction, Anderson oberves a different kind of *furor* between Aeneas and Turnus (William S. Anderson. *The Art of the Aeneid*. (Englewood, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1969) 94-95). Although more analystic than apologetic, Dion also sees a distinction between *furor* and *furiae* and provides various statistics for their occurences (400, 407-408, 415). And much like Sarah Donaldson, ("Direness and its Place in the *Aeneid*," *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 13, 1988, 100-101), he sees the Furies driving one's *furor* (417; 423) (Jeanne Dion. *Les passions dans l'oeuvre de Virgile*. (Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 1993).

27. Putnam, "Anger," 22-39.

28. S.J. Harrison. *Vergil. Aeneid 10*. (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991), xxiii-iv.

29. Hritzu, 102; Anderson, *The Art*, 98; Pöschl, 58. For the argument against this opinion see Gransden, 214; W. R. Johnson, 362.

30. Thornton, "The Last Scene," 82; G. Williams, 223-224; Gransden, 212; G. Duckworth, "Fate and Free Will in the *Aeneid*," *CJ* 51, 1955-56, 362. For a response to this argument see W. R. Johnson, 363; William Anderson, 98; Kenneth Quinn, "La Morte di Turno," *Maio* 16, 1964, 347-348; *Virgil's Aeneid*, 274-275; Putnam, *The Art*, 193; Lee, 153. H. P. Stahl says that Aeneas' final actions are morally justifiable if we view him, as Vergil intended the reader to do so, as a grieving father ("The Death of Turnus: Augustan Vergil and the Political Rival," *Between Republic and Empire Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate* (Raaflaub and Toher, eds.). (Berkeley, CA: U of California P, 1990), 174-211).

31. For a discussion and sources for this attitude see Poe, 335; Jackson-Knight, 142-143; M. Berynyi-Revesz, "Le Prince Democratique de l' Eneide," *Annales Universitatis Scientarum Budapestinensis* 4, 1976, 31-32, 35. With regard to the final Turnus scene Hardie suggests four models for Aeneas' behavior. Two of these, Gigantomachy and the Dying Gaul, demonstrate "the primitive victory of order over disorder" and "a positive affirmation of the rightness of Roman might ..." (*Vergil's Aeneid*, 152-154). Braun proposes Aeneas in the role of a good king after the Homeric model rather than a Stoic sage (215-216).

32. Anderson, *The Art*, 99-100.

33. John F. Hall, "The Original Ending of the Aeneas Tale: Cato and the Historiographical Tradition of Aeneas," *Syllecta Classica* III, 1992, 20. Although Hall's intention is not to deal with the matter of *furor*, the ambiguity of his final statement is intriguiging; that is, in respect to what had Aeneas "too much ... become the person of Augustus Caesar ..."? Hall's point is that Aeneas must survive as Augustus must, but is the *furor* a part of this means of survival? For Aeneas becoming Augustus, see also Harry C. Rutledge, "Pius Aeneas: A Study of Vergil's Portrait," *Vergilius* 33, 1987, 20 and especially n. 19.

34. William R. Nethercut. "American Scholarship on Vergil," *Vergil at 2000. Commemorative Essays on the Poet and his Influence* (John D. Bernard, ed.). (New York: AMS Press, 1986) 312-313.

35. Poe, 324; William Anderson, 99; Gransden, 216; Hritzu, 108; Miles, 134, 159; Thornton, 84; Edwards, 161-162. Harrison muses that perhaps Turnus would rise again to cause trouble if he were not completely vanquished, but Williams seems more to think that the "sudden cut-off" of the poem is Vegil's method "to reinforce the ultimate ambivalence of his outlook on the war" (S. J. Harrison, "Vergil as a Poet of War," *Proceedings of the Virgil Society* 18, 1986, 66). Although his focus is on the ending of the *Aeneid* with a view to the interplay between Juno and Jupiter, Schmidt speculates that Vergil was awaiting the Golden Age despite Augustus, as the poem's ending may indicate. See also 82-85 for a useful discussion on the scholarship of the epic's ending.

36. Wendell Clausen. "An Interpretation of the

Aeneid," *Virgil* (Steele Commanger, ed.). (Englewood, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1966), 85-86. Rhona Beare, "Invidious Success: Some Thoughts on *Aeneid* XII," *Proceedings of Vergil Society*, 1964, 30; Miles, 134.

37. Putnam, *The Art*, 174, 196; Poe, 334; Quinn, "La Morte," 341-43; Miles, 159; Boyle, 69-70, 85; Farron, "The Furor," 204-208. See Nicholas Horsfall on the so-called "bivocalism" in the *Aeneid* (192-193 and *Appendix, 313*).

38. Putnam, *The Art*, 193; Poe, 324; Boyle, 69; Wilson, 74; Little, 72; Anderson, 99-100.

39. Poe, 324, 335; Hanson, 67; Fowler discusses his own and others' research on the idea "that spoils taken from an enemy were in Homer and the Greek tragedians ill-omened, bringing trouble on the despoiler," or in this case upon the despoiler's legacy, the Empire (W. Warde Fowler. *The Death of Turnus*. (London: Oxford UP, 1919) 155.

40. Although Suerbaum does not treat Aeneas' passions, he views him as one caught between the past and the future and one who reaches a positive and moral synthesis in the present in Italy (Werner Suerbaum, "Der Aeneas Vergils - Mann zwischen Vergangenheit und Zukunft," *Gymnasium* 100, 1993, 419-447.

41. Lee, 141-42; W. R. Johnson, 133; Poe, 336. R. A. Brooks. "Discolor Aura: Reflections of the Golden Bough," *Virgil* (Steel Commager, ed.). (Englewood, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1966), 163.

42. Miles, 159; Anderson, 99; Little, 69-70, 72, 75; W. R. Johnson, 360, 362, 364.

43. Mackie, 218. Camps sees human nature as thwarting nearly accomplished *pietas* when he says that the *Aeneid* "exhibits the victory of the virtues of discipline, principle and duty over unregulated emotion ..." but also adds in the case of the epic's ending that "principle can be misguided, and become self-righteously inhuman ..." (W. A. Camps, "Some Personal Reflections on Virgilian and Homeric Narrative," *Proceedings of the Virgil Society* 18, 1986, 141). Although Donaldson treats only *dirae* and its related nouns and adjectives, one wonders if her thesis may not also apply to *furiae*. She argues that all that is "dire" is at the same time religious - meaning that it is connected to Fate - and emotional - meaning that it is the internal, individual response (100-01). Applied to *furiae* and the like, this would represent an irresistable world force and one's inevitable response to it. It could account for Aeneas' ineluctable situation and his final reaction.

44. Galinsky, 132; H. L. Tracy, "The Gradual Unfolding of Aeneas' Destiny," *CJ* 48, 1953, 282.

45. S. Farron, "The Abruptness of the End of the Aeneid," *AClass* 25, 1982, 140; Galinsky, 133; Gransden, 212. Arguing specifically against Farron, Springer says that the Aeneid's "abrupt" ending follows a tradition in which there is an absence of an epilogue and that Vergil's ending is, in fact, quite similar to that of the *Iliad*. He demonstrates that in both epics the final scenes focus on the antagonists, Hector and Turnus. Although Springer does not defend Aeneas' violence, his observations conclude that there is nothing unique about Aeneas' final actions. (Carl P. E. Springer, "The Last Line of the *Aeneid*," *CJ* 82, 1986-87, 310-313)

46. Gransden, 216. Putnam also speaks of "the non-finality" of the poem due to "the open-endedness of anger and hatred" ("Anger," 39).

47. David Quint. *Epic and Empire*. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1993) 78-82.

48. Gransden, 216. In discussing the end of the epic, Horsfall sets up seven "keys," that is, sets of ethical criteria "which might be applied to condemn (or to acquit) Aeneas on a charge of homicidal mania" (208-9). After a lengthy treatment of each, he concludes, "The reader who scanned these pages in the hope of learning exactly where I stand ... will, I am confident, depart frustrated and annoyed ... I do not give it (the "answer" to the epic), because it is not there" (216). He continues that only in the "inner logic" of the text does the poet offer a "reasoned answer." Although Virgil and Aeneas are right in the end, "there is no general resolution of issues and tensions, such as to leave us (or Aeneas) emotionally at ease or content" (216).

-------- SELECTA --------

Ambiguity and Binarism in Georges Feydeau's *La Puce à l'oreille*

James Mills
Southern Utah University

Georges Feydeau (1862-1921) was a leading contributor to the *théâtre du boulevard* during France's *Belle Epoque*. His boudoir farces, mostly concerned with the appetites and follies of demi-monde society, provided an alternative to the contemporary Naturalists and Symbolists.

His theater mirrored *la Belle Epoque's* quest for identity by seeking some logic and reason in the midst of perceived madness. His *Weltanschauung* was one in which the innocent suffered without understanding why, where the outrageous appeared reasonable, and sexual perversions and inadequacies, absurdity and madness were the daily norm; but ultimately his plays proffer benign conclusions, where the *komos* asserts itself and there is a return to stasis.

In *La Puce à l'oreille* (1907), one of Feydeau's most renowned plays, written at the apogee of his thirty-six-year career, he portrays characters and situations which are constantly confused until no one can make any sense out of life, and all relationships survive from one crisis to the next in a decadent world. Described by Michael Billington as "superb" because the plot "reaches the heights of artifice but the characters themselves have a basic reality" (315), the play signaled the dramatist's return to what Norman Shapiro has referred to as the "jack-in-the-box constructions of earlier triumphs" (xxxix), meaning the type of play in which characters are thrown into burlesque situations. Richard Hayes chooses to call Feydeau's fusion of verbal wit and technical skills, "the mathematics of theater" (154). In a more ominous tone, Leonard Pronko has suggested that lurking beneath "the frenetically joyous surface, however, is a vision of a world in explosion . . ." (GF 5).

This paper examines Feydeau's use of binaristic devices in *La Puce à l'oreille* to depict the ambiguities of love, the confusion of identities, and deliberate deceptions and miscommunications, with the view of better understanding their application and purpose as he attempts to create order from chaos.

The three-act play opens in the married household of Victor-Emmanuel and Raymonde Chandebise, where begins a misunderstanding over the ownership of a pair of suspenders. This confusion leads to the infamous Hôtel du Minet Galant of Act II, where an extended *quiproquo* develops involving the identities of Chandebise and a hotel-worker named Poche, who are both played by the same actor. The ensuing confusion lasts until the final scene of Act III, where a rather insipid resolution presents itself to end the play quietly.

Feydeau had originally intended to title the work, *Les Maris des deux pôles*, because it dealt with the opposing temperaments of the two main characters. However, his selection of the present title serves well to underscore metaphorically the primary plot and offers several subtle interpretations. It refers to a pair of suspenders given by Chandebise to his cousin, Camille Chandebise, who absentmindedly leaves them at the Hôtel du Minet Galant after one of his secret trysts with a lady. When the suspenders are returned by mail to the Chandebise home,

Victor-Emmanuel's wife opens the package and recognizes them as a pair which she had previously purchased for her husband. Given his recent unexplained lack of intimate attention toward his wife and her ignorance of his recently acquired sexual impotence, Raymonde mistakenly assumes that he has been unfaithful to her at the hotel. The suspenders are "la puce" which provokes her to action and causes the plot to unfold.

First used in 1170 in the French work, *Rois, la pulce* comes from the Latin *pulex, -icis* (masculine). Literally, the word means "a flea," an irritating parasitical insect which lives off mammals by sucking their blood after pricking them. Its etymology is related to the verb "to flee," which is also the dominant action of the second and third acts of the play, in which the characters blindly run around in a frenzied panic. The flea has great agility in jumping on its prey and has a beak containing a sting which renders its bite painful. This may have metaphoric applications in a play centered around a revolving bed and revolving partners.

The omission of the verb at the beginning of the title lends a certain ambivalence, for "mettre la puce à l'oreille," suggests the proactive "to inspire worry," while "avoir la puce à l'oreille," denotes the reactive "to be on the alert." The former variation of the idiom was first used at the beginning of the fourteenth century and meant, "provoquer chez quelqu'un le désir amoureux," and "inspirer des inquiétudes." The first meaning has since disappeared; the second is still in use today (*Nouveau dictionnaire* 614). Feydeau uses the expression to mean "unwelcome intelligence."

The inclusion of "l'oreille" in the idiom also offers imagistic nuances, for while it is the organ used for hearing, no one in the play ever seems to listen or hear accurately. It is the place where secrets are whispered and lovers speak soft words, yet felicitious love is absent from the play. Consisting of three parts, the ear is made up of the outer, middle, and inner ear, the latter being the labyrinthine part which controls equilibrium. The irony here is that everyone in the play is caught up in a frenzied whirlwind of action described by Henry Gidel as "endiablée" and "vertigineuse" (*Théâtre complet* III 516). Even the audience is left out of kilter, off-balance as it were, unable to catch its breath.

Many of the characters similarly function in binaristic roles. Camille, for example, is an obedient secretary at home, but a playboy at the hotel. The impotent Chandebise loves his wife, yet at one point, contemplates the thrill of being wanted by an unknown admirer. His wife permits his friend Romain Tournel to attempt to seduce her, but reverts to a state of fidelity when she thinks that her husband is being unfaithful to her. The Latin American Homenidès claims to love his wife, but treats her abusively, while she remains faithful to him, but is victimized by him.

Nobody trusts anybody else. Homenidès tells his wife, Lucienne, on their wedding night that he will kill her if she is ever unfaithful. Tournel deceives his friend by pursuing his wife, who, in turn, suspects her husband of being unfaithful. The butler, Etienne, suspects that his wife, Antoinette, is spying on him, when it is she who is having an affair with Camille Chandebise. According to Arlette Shenkan, "Le spectacle le plus surprenant est sans doute celui de l'humanité mise à nu par Feydeau. L'égoïsme, la désinvolture, l'intérêt personnel sont de règle" ("Amuseur" 83).

Another critic simply describes Feydeau's theater as one of "concealment" (Farrell 312).

The playwright had previously used mistaken identities and deception in many of his plays, including *La Dame de chez Maxim* (1899), where la Môme Crevette assumes the identity of Madame Petypon, and *Champignol malgré lui* (1892), where Saint-Florimond is mistaken for Champignol. In *L'Age d'or* (1905), four actors play two or more parts each, but with no *quiproquo* based on *le sosie* (double). However, *La Puce à l'oreille* is the only Feydeau play to have the identical-appearance device with the parts of Chandebise and Poche played by the same actor.

The use of the two-character principle is also applied in the play when two characters who are constantly at odds are put in contact with other. Such is the case with the butler and his wife, and the hotel-keeper, Augustin Ferraillon and his abused wife, Olympe (Reney 32). Feydeau once acknowledged, "Je mets toujours en présence . . . les deux personnes qui ne doivent pas se voir" (Lauwick 83), a fact further underscored by the confusion of identities between Poche and Chandebise, who never meet until the end of the play, for it is both their failure to meet and the threat of their meeting which create the tension of the plot.

Similarly, the arrival at the hotel of two telegrams signed "Chandebise," both requesting room reservations, creates turmoil, for one is from Raymonde, who has set a trap for her husband by having her friend Lucienne Homenidès write an anonymous letter to him from a "secret admirer" seeking a rendezvous at the hotel. However, believing that the letter is actually directed at his friend, Tournel, Chandebise sends him instead to keep the secret meeting. The other telegram is from Camille Chandebise, who wants a room for a tryst with the butler's wife, Antoinette. The hotel-keepers are unclear about who is reserving what, and pandemonium follows.

The Hôtel du Minet Galant has a name which is rich in bawdy nuances in *le français familier* and functions as a hot-bed of activity where favors are clandestinely exchanged. The *raison d'être* of the English guest, Rugby, is to pursue any woman who looks at him, and is on the bed with Antoinette when her husband accidentally discovers them. Homenidès mistakes a veiled Raymonde for his wife. At one point, he is in the middle of fighting with Camille when the bed suddenly revolves to reveal his wife in the other bed with the valet, Poche. The aging Baptistin is used by the Ferraillons to occupy one of the two revolving beds so that should the couple in the other bed be in danger of discovery, the beds can rotate to reveal him fast asleep in a drunken stupor. Sometimes the beds revolve uncontrollably and lovers anticipating their partner are stupefied to find Baptistin in his or her place. Meanwhile, Chandebise arrives at the hotel and is promptly mistaken for Poche by the Ferraillons and treated abusively by them while Poche is mistaken for Chandebise by his friends and the whirlwind spins even more ferociously.

Feydeau's treatment of love similarly reveals ambiguities and nuances. While Pronko asserts that the play is the dramatist's most complete picture of love, it seems to me that it is so only to the degree that it is inclusive of multiple approaches to love (GF 71). For example, I have already mentioned the relationship between Chandebise and his wife with its suspicions and unconsummated

infidelity, which last until the final scene in which he suggests, rather insipidly, that his impotence might end:

> Raymonde: Je te demande pardon, j'ai tort! mais, qu'est-ce tu veux, je doutais de ta fidélité!
>
> Chandebise: A moi, Dieu bon! et pourquoi? pourquoi?
>
> Raymonde: Mais parce que... Eh! bien, tiens, parce que... (Elle lui parle à l'oreille.)
>
> Chandebise: Non! pour si peu?
>
> Raymonde: Quoi? Mais dis *à cause* de ce si peu!
>
> Chandebise: Oh! ben!
>
> Raymonde: Qu'est-ce que tu veux, c'est bête... Mais ça m'avait mis la puce à l'oreille.
>
> Chandebise: Sacrée puce, va! (Comme s'il relevait un défi.) C'est bien! (Plus en sourdine.) Je la tuerai ce soir.
>
> Raymonde: (avec un peu d'ironie.) Toi?
>
> Chandebise: (avec un geste moins faraud.) Euh...enfin...j'essaierai.... (Gidel, *Théâtre complet* III, 672-673)

Future quotations from the play and specific references to it will be listed with the editor and page number only.)

The first act opens with Antoinette kissing Camille on the back of the head, followed by a kiss on the lips administered by Camille, that is described as "un baiser goulu" (Gidel 526). Ironically, as I have previously mentioned, the cuckolded butler, Etienne, believes that Antoinette is actually suspicious of him (Gidel 527). To the lustful Rugby, love is a conquest to be made. Ferraillon is a sadist, who admits that he married his wife because she used to be a courtesan named "Culotte de peau" who liked his military uniform. He proudly tells Doctor Finache that Olympe once had herself served up nude on a silver platter (Gidel 585). She, on the other hand, finds a masochistic pleasure in being kicked and abused by him. Poche also finds a certain satisfaction in being kicked by Ferraillon. Interestingly , while it is *le sosie* and the revolving beds which attract attention today, when the play first opened at the Nouveautés on March 2, 1907, it was Augustin and Olympe Ferraillon, with their coarse and brazen mannerisms, who attracted the greatest attention (Gidel, *Théâtre complet* III 515-516).

Doctor Finache hints at his homosexuality when he suggests a *ménage-à-trois* with Etienne, himself and Homenidès (Gidel 530-531). Later, he reveals his interest in Poche's predecessor Gabriel, whom he describes as a "trop joli garçon" (Gidel 583-584). Indeed, the Hôtel du Minet Galant is a place of compromising situations and intrigue, a view captured by Eugénie, one of the maids, in the following conversation with Ferraillon:

> Ferraillon: Oh! quoi! quoi! de l'esprit, maintenant! Pas de ça, Lisette! Non, mais dites tout de suite que vous prenez ma maison pour un hôtel borgne!
>
> Eugénie: (ironique.) Oh!
>
> Ferraillon: Non, mademoiselle! Vous saurez que c'est une maison de luxe! un hôtel... comme il faut! où il ne vient que des gens mariés. (Il redescend un peu à gauche.)
>
> Eugénie: Oui, mais pas ensemble. (Gidel 576)

Shenkan has noted that the "douleur des uns fait le bonheur des autres" (GF 96), a concept which dominates the relationship

between Raymonde and her would-be-lover, Tournel. He thinks that he is making progress towards his conquest of her only to have her reclaim fidelity when she mistakenly assumes that her husband is being unfaithful to her. The desperate Tournel now sets out to convince Raymonde that her husband has, in fact, been faithful, at which point she decides to return her affection to Tournel, reasoning that giving herself to him would be her punishment for having doubted her husband, "Oui, oui, c'est le châtiment" (Gidel 593). Tournel seeks to persuade her further by saying, "nous le ferons pour lui," meaning that they will be unfaithful for Victor-Emmanuel (Gidel 593).

A poignant moment follows which reveals the binary views of many men and women towards love. Tournel and Raymonde are still in the room with the revolving bed, and he is making passionate advances towards her, but again she abruptly pushes him away:

> Tournel: (ahuri.) Comment? Mais ne m'avez-vous pas laisser entendre que vous consentiez?...
>
> Raymonde: (vivement et avec hauteur.) A être votre amante...oui! (Gagnant la droite avec dignité.) Mais coucher avec vous! Ah! Me prenez-vous pour une prostituée?
>
> Tournel: (tout à fait sur le rebord du lit et bien pitieux.) Mais alors...quoi?...
>
> Raymonde: (superbe de dignité.) Mais... le flirt, les émotions qu'il comporte: se parler les yeux dans les yeux, la main dans la main. Je vous donne la meilleure partie de moi-même!...
>
> Tournel: (lève la tête vers Raymonde, puis:) Laquelle?
>
> Raymonde: Ma tête ... mon coeur.
>
> Tournel: (en faisant fi.) Oh! pfutt! (Gidel 594)

The scene concludes with Tournel threatening to force himself on Raymonde who, unnoticed by him, pushes the button in the belief that it is a bell, but instead she causes the bed to revolve and Baptistin appears in the other bed. Eyes still closed, Tournel jumps on him and begins to kiss him exclaiming, "Oh! Raymonde! ma Raymonde!" (Gidel 596). Incredibly, she subsequently accuses him of having brought in spectators to watch them (Gidel 599).

A master of animating the objective, Feydeau resorted to the use of a bed in ten of his plays, beginning as early as *Monsieur chasse* (1892). Gidel observes that, designed for lovers, "le lit ne devient jamais le complice d'amours réelles" (*Le Théâtre* 199). In *La Puce à l'oreille* it assumes a binary life subject to human control on the one hand, yet at times appears to have a life of its own. For example, when Homenidès fires his revolver in a rage at the end of the second act, the bullet randomly hits the button that makes the beds revolve and the malfunction sends them spinning uncontrollably with a shrieking Camille in one bed and Baptistin in the other. According to Michael Booth, here is "an excellent demonstration of the Bergsonian view that as man begins to resemble a machine, so he becomes less human and increasingly an object of laughter" (147). In his masterful book, *Le Rire*, Bergson has the following to say about the mechanical element of humans and objects: "Ce n'est plus de la vie, c'est de l'automatisme installé dans la vie et imitant la vie. C'est du comique" (25).

The inability to communicate effectively likewise contributes ambiguous

nuances to the play. Feydeau had previously used characters with physical challenges in *L'Hôtel du Libre-Echange* (1894), where Monsieur Mathieu stammers every time that it rains, in *Le Dindon* (1896), where Madame Pinchard is deaf, and in *La Main passe* (1904), where Lapige barks like a dog. In *La Puce à l'oreille*, Camille has a cleft palate and speaks only in vowels. When the play opens, he is supposed to say, "Allons, voyons," but all that is heard is "A-on! O-on!" (Gidel 526). His problem is temporarily resolved when Doctor Finache gives him a silver palate. The first act ends with Chandebise, upon hearing Camille speak clearly, proclaiming in amazement: "Ah! ...il parle..." (Gidel 572). But Camille loses the palate and he reverts to his unintelligible mumbling.

The second act is a masterpiece of what Peter Marshall calls "verbal choreography" and "comic pas de deux" (361). What Feydeau does is to reproduce life by creating speech filled with vulgarities and familiarities accompanied by miscommunications, mistaken identities, surprise encounters, and frenzied motion conveyed by characters who are in a constant state of flux, changing directions and running up and down stairs as many as twenty-four times in an effort to hide (Parshall 359). According to Shenko: "Comme Ionesco, il met l'accent sur la platitude, l'ennui, le manque d'initiative et d'imagination, l'isolement, l'impossibilité et le refus de communiquer, le désespoir, l'inutilité du langage" ("Amuser" 87).

Each character is wrapped up in his or her own world and occupied with his or her own needs. Individuals conduct conversations oblivious to the comments of others, what Pronko has called "linguistic automatism" (*Eugène Labiche* 39-40). For example, during a discussion between Doctor Finache and Etienne, the butler, each discusses his own problems, mostly inattentive to the other's comments. At one point, Finache says, "J'ai un malade à voir près d'ici, eh! bien, ma foi, je vais l'expédier," which Etienne mistakenly interprets to mean that Finache plans to kill his patient (Gidel 528). When the butler proceeds to describe his own illness, the doctor, tongue in cheek, nonchalantly ascribes it to Etienne's ovaries, to which the latter matter-of-factly responds, "Oui? Eh! bien! j'ai ça, moi!" (Gidel 529). Ironically, when Finache observes, "Comme le monde est petit!" it is in the middle of a conversation where neither is communicating well with the other (Gidel 528).

Contributing to the miscommunication is Homenidès, who frequently speaks his native Spanish, but when he speaks French, it is with a strong accent, as evidenced by lines such as "Yo vous saloue!" and "Où sont-ils, les missérables, que yo les toue, que yo les étrangle?" (Gidel 562, 615). The usually misunderstood Camille attempts to mimic Homenidès, then adds that "On ne comprend pas un mot de ce qu'il dit" (Gidel 570). Lucienne speaks Spanish to her husband and French to her friends, while Rugby speaks only English to everyone. At one point he asks Ferraillon if anybody has called for him, to which the hotel-keeper responds derisively, "Eh! non! ... Nobodé, zut" (Gidel 583). Poche is also mystified by a similar question addressed to him in English by Rugby, and answers, "Tout de suite, Monsieur! (A part.) Il me demande un *nobodécol*. J'sais pas ce que c'est! (Un temps.) Je vas lui servir un

vermouth" (Gidel 591).

There are moments when speech is reduced to nonsensical utterances such as in the seduction scene between Tournel and Raymonde, where he hides behind a curtain and calls out "Coucou!", to which she responds "(A part.) 'Coucou'. Attends un peu." After Tournel utters "Coucou" once more, she pulls the curtain aside and slaps him (Gidel 591). In another scene, where Camille suddenly comes upon the couple, the exclamatory syllables "Eh," "là," and "Ah," are uttered several times, while in astonishment Raymonde and Tournel exclaim three times between them, "C'est pas lui!" and twice, "Il parle!" (Gidel 607).

Gidel honored Feydeau by titling chapter three of his book, *Georges Feydeau*, "le Mozart du vaudeville" (37). In *La Puce à l'oreille*, Feydeau has, in fact, composed a symphony of language and plot with the arias of unfulfilled love, miscommunication, and mistaken identities. Yet, the ubiquitous ambiguities and dichotomies ultimately give way to a return to stasis when Chandebise finally explains the story of the suspenders to his wife and illumination is shed on *le sosie*, thus bringing the painful *quiproquo* to a conclusion. The *komos* returns to reassure the audience that in spite of the madness of it all, life, such as it is, must still be lived.

Works Cited

Bergson, Henri. *Le Rire*. 1899. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1950.

Billington, Michael. "A Flea in he Ear." *The Listener* 3 Mar. 1966. p. 315.

Booth, Michael. "Feydeau and the Farcical Imperative." *Farce*. Vol. 10. *Themes in Drama*. Ed. James Redmond. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988. pp. 145-152.

Farrell, Joseph. "Fo and Feydeau: Is Farce a Laughing Matter?" *Italica* 72:3 (1995). pp. 307-322.

Gidel, Henry. *Georges Feydeau*. Paris: Flammarion, 1991.

— , ed. *Le Théâtre complet de Georges Feydeau*. 4 vols. Paris: Bordais, 1988.

— . *Le Théâtre de Georges Feydeau*. Paris: Editions Klincksieck, 1979.

Hayes, Richard. "The Mathematics of Farce." *Commonweal* 10 May, 1957. p. 154.

Lauwick, Hervé. *D'Alphonse Allais à Sacha Guitry*. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1963.

Parshall, Peter F. "Feydeau's *A Flea in Her Ear*: The Art of Kinesthetic Structure." *Theatre Journal* (1981): 355-364.

Pronko, Leonard C. *Eugène Labiche and Georges Feydeau*. New York: Grove P, 1982.

— . *Georges Feydeau*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1975. Indicated in notes as (GF).

"Puce." *Nouveau Dictionnaire étymologique et historique*. Ed. Albert Dauzat, Jean Dubois, Henri Mitterand. Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1971.

Reney, George Richard. "The Dramatic Technique of the Comic Playwright Georges Feydeau." Diss. Columbia:U of Missouri, 1973.

Shapiro, Norman, trans. *Four Farces by Georges Feydeau*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1970.

Shenkan, Arlette. *Georges Feydeau*. Paris: Editions Seghers, 1972.

— . "Georges Feydeau: Simple amuseur?" *Bulletin de la Société des professeurs français en Amérique* (1978). pp. 73-88.

From the Editor

This is the first volume of SELECTA to be published on the World Wide Web, as well as in a very limited paper format. It can be found on the web at: http://www.usd.edu/selecta/ Articles are in .pdf format and can be downloaded using Adobe Acrobat Reader, which can be secured for no charge from the internet.

Financial difficulties (some used more direct language) in PNCFL brought matters to a point where the Board felt itself unable to continue this publication in the printed format used through Volume 19. As editor I offered to continue the journal - at no cost to the PNCFL organization - for a year, and to publish it on the internet after the appearance of the limited paper edition. That year, and my editorship, has come to an end with this volume.

Whether or not SELECTA will continue to offer scholars an opportunity to publish their research will depend upon whether the PNCFL Officers and Board are willing to offer the journal some support. Given SELECTA's very modest cost to the organization and considerable service to the profession, one would hope they might decide to do so.

Most importantly, however, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the many colleagues who over the past several years have volunteered their time and expertise as Editorial Consultants. Every manuscript since 1992 has been subjected to blind review by capable and dedicated professionals, which for articles published in this journal has validated their claim to serious scholarship. And I am not less appreciative of the many scholars who have submitted their work for publication and cooperated so willingly to produce the volumes which have offered the profession so much.

Craig W. Nickisch
Professor and Editor, 1992-1999

"Die Fahne hoch!" Das *Horst-Wessel-Lied* als Nationalhymne

Craig W. Nickisch
Idaho State University

> Whenever German Nazis gather the militant strains of the "Horst Wessel Lied" are heard. It is their campaign song, their battle cry, now their hymn of triumph, too.
>
> *- The New York Times*
> *March 26, 1933*

Verschollen und fast vergessen ist das *Horst-Wessel-Lied*, deutsche Lyrik, die zu ihrer Zeit Tausende in Bewegung setzte. Dieses Gedicht, kurz nach seiner Entstehung vertont, erhielt sofort in der NSDAP eine begeisterte Zuhörerschaft. Unter anderen Parteiparolen und rhetorischen Nazifloskeln ist das *Horst-Wessel-Lied* jedoch nicht geblieben; es erreichte auch im Volke einen beträchtlichen Widerhall. Nach der Machtergreifung wurde das *Horst-Wessel-Lied* von der nationalsozialistischen Regierung neben dem *Deutschlandlied* zur Nationalhymne erhoben. Beeindruckt wurden auch Außenseiter, gespiegelt zum Beispiel in *Cabaret* und auch in Wouks *War and Remembrance*, als Aaron Jastrow, unterwegs ins KZ, an das *Horst-Wessel-Lied* denkt: "Those early feelings flood over hm. Ridiculous though he thought the Nazis were [in the mid-thirties], their song did embody a certain elemental German wistfulness ...."[1]

Interesse an "Deutsch und also Geschichte" trägt zwangsläufig dazu bei, daß man diesem Liede auf die Spuren geht.[2] Das ist freilich der Zweck dieser Arbeit, nicht im Sinne einer Vergangenheitsbewältigung, sonder mit zeitlichem, räumlichem und geistigem Abstand die Erscheinungen durchzuarbeiten, eine "Vergangenheits-aufarbeitung" also.

Heute sind die Spuren der braunen Bataillone verblichen, ihr Lied ist oft erwähnt jedoch so gut wie nie sachlich unter die Lupe genommen worden. Daß das *Horst-Wessel-Lied* jedoch ein "historisch-gesellschaftliches Ereignis" von erheblicher Bedeutung gewesen ist, wird aber kaum bestritten.[3] Dichtung, die politisch-revolutionären Quellen entspringt oder an solchen Ereignissen teilnimmt, muß nicht unbedingt schlecht sein, sie kann dauerhafte Dichtung werden. Und das gilt auch für Dichtung, die in fraglichen Diensten steht. So unnötig wie zweckmäßig ist es zu erwähnen, daß spätere Taten der NSDAP diesbezüglich außerhalb einer solchen Betrachtung stünden. Allein die zeitliche Entfernung von einigen Jahrzehnten müßte es uns erlauben, die Dichtung anzufassen, ohne die mit ihr verbundenen - und hier sei erwähnt, die nach ihr gekommenen - politischen Ereignisse bejahen zu müssen.

Nach dem Zusammenbruch jener deutschen Regierung wurde das *Horst-Wessel-Lied* von den Siegermächten verbannt und sogar in der Fachliteràtur, wenn überhaupt, höchstens als Hinweis aufgeführt. Germanisten gehören leider auch zu denen, deren Beziehungen zum *Horst-Wessel-Lied* manche Wandlung - man könnte Verdrängung vermuten - vollzogen haben. Paul Fechter zum Beispiel behauptete 1941, daß "Horst Wessel das bestimmende Lied der neuen Zeit" geschaffen habe. In Fechters 1960 erschienener *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* wird Horst Wessel nicht einmal erwähnt.[4] Intellektueller Abstand ist für eine Vergangenheitsaufarbeitung unentbehrlich.

Wessel, Jahrgang 1907, entstammte einem kaiserlich gesinnten Elternhaus. Er war ein guter Schüler, mit 16 Jahren im Bismarck-Bund, dann Student der Rechtswissenschaften in Berlin, wo sein Vater, ein evangelischer Pfarrer und ehemaliger Feldgeistlicher bei Generalfeldmarschall von Hindenburg, von Paul Gerhardts Kanzel in der Sankt-Nikolai-Kirche predigte.

Im Dezember 1926 trat Wessel in die NSDAP und SA ein. Er gab sein Studium auf, um unter dem Volke als Bauarbeiter und zeitweiliger Taxifahrer zu leben - wie es ähnlich Handelnde in den 60er Jahren getan haben. Er soll der meistgefragte Redner Berlins gewesen sein - nach Dr. Goebbels, versteht sich. 1929 war Wessel Bezirksleiter und Führer des SA Sturm 5, Standort im Arbeiterviertel Berlin-Friedrichshain. Nebenbei hauste er mit einer ehemaligen Grisette, Erna Jänicke, zusammen.[5] Von einer Verwicklung Wessels in die Zuhälterei liegt aber kein Befund vor, und Erna behauptete den "gewissen Beruf" aufgegeben zu haben. Ernas ehemaliger Zuhälter, sechzehn Mal vorbestraft und selbsterklärter Kommunist, nahm aber Anstoß, kam zu Wessel in die Wohnung und feuerte ihm eine Kugel durch Kehle und Kiefer. Der Notarzt wurde von Wessels SA-Sturm abgewiesen - er war Jude. Dr. Goebbels erstattete ihm noch im Krankenhaus einen Besuch, bevor Wessel am 23. Februar 1930 einer Blutvergiftung erlag.

Aus Wessels Verhältnis zu dem Mädchen haben Gegner der NSDAP, darunter Bert Brecht, vor und nach 1945 politisch zu profitieren versucht. Aber eine so bürgerlich-moralische Auffassung wirkt, gerade bei Brecht und heute mehr denn je, überzeugungskarg. Da aber auf der anderen Seite die Propaganda von Dr. Goebbels Horst Wessel sofort zum Volkshelden machte, bleibt der eigentliche Wessel wohl noch lange verborgen. Wessels frühe Biographien (bis Ende der Nazizeit gab es derer etliche Hunderte) gehören zu der gesteuerten Literatur des Dritten Reiches und liefern bestenfalls höchst zweifelhafte Berichte über sein vermeintlich heldenhaftes Leben und Märtyrertum.[6]

Vergegenwärtigen wir uns der politischen Lage gegen Ende der 20er Jahre. Die Übereinstimmung zwischen Wort, hier "Wahlkampf", und Ereignis ist selten genauer gewesen. Die SA, 1929 bestehend aus Männern, die Arbeitslosigkeit und Inflation kannten und denen das Wort "Brot" ein Begriff war, waren die Frontkämpfer der NSDAP, und die SA hatte in jener deprimierenden politischen Situation die Aufgabe, Versammlungen und Redner anderer Parteien zu stören und deren Anhänger zu verprügeln, sowohl wie die Verteidigung der NSDAP-Veranstaltungen gegen ähnliche Terror-Gruppen anderer Parteien, hauptsächlich der Rotfront, zu gewährleisten.

Diesem militanten SA-Milieu, in der NSDAP als "Kampfzeit" genannt, entstammt das *Horst-Wessel-Lied*, dessen mit 22 Jahren erschossener Verfasser nur irgendeiner unter den etlichen Hunderten von unbekannten Toten der Straßenschlägereien und -schießereien geblieben wäre. Im August 1929 jedoch ist im Parteiorgan *Der Angriff* das Gedicht erschienen, das nach Wessels Tode seinen Namen erhielt. Im *Angriff* erschienen regelmäßig auf einem beigefügten Blatt, "Der unbekannte SA-Mann", Berichte, Gedichte und Reportagen von und über die SA-Kämpfer selbst. Wessels Gedicht, schon eher als der Mann selbst, liefterte den Stoff,

aus welchem die NDSAP ihren größten Märtyrer schuf.

Nun zum Gedicht selbst. Hier der Wortlaut aus dem *Angriff*:

Die Fahne hoch!

Die Fahne hoch! Die Reihen dicht geschlossen!
S.A. marschiert mit ruhig festem Schritt.
Kameraden, die Rotfront und Reaktion
erschossen
Marschiern im Geist in unsern Reihen mit.

Die Straße frei den braunen Bataillonen!
Die Straße frei dem Sturmabteilungsmann!
Es schaun aufs Hakenkreuz voll Hoffnung schon
Millionen.
Der Tag für Freiheit und für Brot bricht an.

Zum letzten Mal wird nun Appell geblasen!
Zum Kampfe stehn wir alle schon bereit.
Bald flattern Hitlerfahnen über allen Straßen.
Die Knechtschaft dauert nur noch kurze Zeit!

Bruchstücke, manchmal das ganze Lied hört man heute noch in Schallplatten- oder Tonbandausgaben von Werken, die die NS-Zeit in Deutschland behandeln. Der Text übermittelt den Eindruck einer Kampfhymne. Der Literaturkritiker von Bormann betrachtet es als "Gruppenlied," ein Gesang für die Menge, worin dem Einzelnen keine Wahl mehr geboten wird.[7] Ohne das *Horst-Wessel-Lied* genau einzuordnen, weist Ketelsen auf eine Art Agitationsgedicht hin, bedingt durch die Blut- und Fahnensymbolik, worin man eine Alltagshandlung (Sammeln der Mitglieder - Parolen - abgeschlossene Welt) erkennen kann. Zu einer anderen Gattung der nationalsozialistischen Lieder gehören bei ihm die "Bekenntnisgedichte," häufig durch Marschieren gekennzeichnet, worin das Ich in die Gruppe eingegangen ist.[8] Das ist scheinbar echt aus den Leiden und Belangen des Dichters entstanden, und dürfte einem ganz klaren Zwecke dienen. Schonauer würde es "Gebrauchsliteratur" bezeichnen.[9] Er weist interessanterweise deutlich darauf hin, daß politische Dichtung zeitlos sei und ihre Schönheit und Wirkung behalten könne (vgl. Walther von der Vogelweide, Dante, Neruda, ja sogar selbst Brecht).

Eine Skandierung des Liedes zeigt gewisse Ähnlichkeiten mit dem traditionellen Volkslied. Das Gedicht besteht aus drei 4-zeiligen Strophen. Andere Merkmale (z.B. der Jambus, Kreuzreim, Strophenzahl und -aufbau) belegen die Tatsache, daß die Lieder zweifelsohne zum Singen gedacht waren. Bei näherer Betrachtung aber hört man auf, ans Volkslied zu denken. Die Form ist so bearbeitet, daß man davon ausgehen muß, der Dichter habe sich alles gründlich überlegt. Es gibt anscheinened nichts Zufälliges daran. Metrisch und vom Reim her gesehen ist das Gedicht konsequent aber nicht monoton, einheitlich aber nicht eintönig.

Bis auf die Zäsur gleichen sich die Strophen praktisch ganz. Mit dem Kreuzreim zusammen erscheinen abwechselnd dunkle und helle (hintere und vordere) Vokale. Der Reim ist, mit einer kaum hörbaren Abweichung (-asen/-aßen), auffallend rein. Die Zeilen sind 5-hebig, bis auf die 6-hebige dritte Zeile. Das Gegebene, das Befohlene wird in Strophe eins und z.T. auch in Strophe zwei durch Zäsur unterstrichen, aber in der letzten Strophe, wo Bekenntnis und Versprechen geäußert werden, fehlt die Abruptheit der Zäsuren. Durch das Metrum und den daraus entstandenen Rhythmus intensiviert das dichterische Ich seine Bejahung jener Begriffe. In der letzten Strophe dann entspannt sich die in den Strophen eins und zwei geschaffene Intensität.

Vom Metrum her lassen sich auch andere Vermutungen bestätigen. Jede Strophe enthält in den ersten zwei Zeilen das Gegebene, das Szenenbestimmende. Die dritte Zeile wird erzählerischer und wirkt schon durch die Länge informierend. Der Rückgang dann auf die Kürze in der vierten Zeile löst jeweils die Spannung, die zuvor in der Strophe heraufbeschwört wird.

Der Reim deckt sich mit der Abwechslung der Vokale, das Hin- und Herziehen einer Schlacht oder eines Kampfes darstellend. Daß der Ausgang dunkel anfängt und hell ausgeht paßt vollkommen zum politischen Versprechen.

Die Handlung, insofern man von einer sprechen darf, entwickelt sich vom Fahnenbild vor den marschierenden SA-Männern, die der Gefallenen gedenken, durch die Eroberung der Straßen (somit der Opposition), bis zur Ankunft des Parteiabzeichens, das Hoffnung, Freiheit und Wohlstand verspricht. Strophe zwei fängt mit zwei Imperativen an. In der letzten Strophe ist der Kampf vorbei, man ist jedoch bereit, sich weiter für das Volk einzusetzen. Die letzte Zeile beinhaltet ein persöhnliches Bekenntnis vom Dichter (d.h. auch vom Sänger) und das Versprechen, der endgültige Sieg stünde vor der Tür.[10]

Vom Inhalt ausgehend stimmen im Großen und Ganzen die Vermutungen, die man vom Metrum her hat. Die ersten zwei Zeilen deuten die Lage an und bestimmen das vom Dichter erstellte Bild.

Strophe 1: Marschierende SA, in Reihen, sicher, zusammen.

Strophe 2: Kommandos, unerbittliches Verlangen, das Ziel klar im Auge.

Strophe 3: Die letzte Schlacht vorbei, SA steht bereit, dem Volke weiter zu dienen.

Die dritte Zeile enthält jeweils einen etwas erhabeneren Gedanken, der durch das Metrum (hier eine Hebung mehr als in anderen Versen) emporgehoben wird.

Strophe 1: Erinnerung an gefallene Kameraden.

Strophe 2: Parteiabzeichen dient als Symbol der Hoffung für die Massen.

Strophe 3: Die Siegeszeichen lodern überall.

Die vierte Zeile bringt dann in konzentrierter Form den Schluß, die Lösung der Strophe.

Strophe 1: Die Gefallenen marschieren "im Geiste" mit - eine Art ewigen Lebens.

Strophe 2: Das Ziel ist im Werden, praktisch erreicht, da die Gegner beseitigt wurden.

Strophe 3: Die bisherigen Anstrengungen werden bald belohnt. Persönliches Engagement wird ausgesprochen und das Versprechen, daß der Kampf um die Macht gleich vorbei ist, beendet das Lied.

Anknüpfung an alte militärische Motive ist unverkennbar. Uhlands "Der gute Kamerad" ist in der Herkunft der ersten Strophe sicherlich vorhanden. Die zweite erinnert an "wenn die Soldaten durch die Stadt marschieren," und die dritte Strophe findet allein durch die Fahne Wurzeln in manchem Soldantenlied. Wie groß die heutige Distanz zu der SA auch sein mag, daß sie aber Anklang und Beifall unter dem Volk - viele waren Veteranen des Ersten Weltkrieges - erzielte, daß der SA-Mann sich als Soldat einer revolutionären Freiheitsbewegung fühlte, liegt auf der Hand.

Selbst die Sprache, man bedenke ihren Ursprung, ist gewogen, politisch-

symbolisch und bildhaft. Kühle Sachlichkeit entspricht völlig den Vorstellungen eines SA-Mannes. Die rauhstarken Worte entstammen der Blut-, Boden- und Rassenideologie. Die nationalsozialistische Parole "Freiheit und Brot" erscheint in der zweiten Strophe, wo sich die Frage erhebt: "Wo hört die Dichtung auf, wo fängt die Parole an?" Diese Frage wäre jedoch für Horst Wessel undenkbar gewesen.

Der Ablauf des Gedichts entspricht dem Wesen der verwendeten Verben. Unter statischen Partizipien "geschlossen" und "erschossen" marschiert die SA. Die zweite Strophe wird durch die Verben "schauen und "anbrechen" merklich erregter, aktiver. Die dritte Strophe ist dann wieder ruhiger, sogar ein Passiv erscheint. Weitere Verben wie "stehen" und "dauern", ja sogar "flattern" beschreiben eher einen Zustand als eine Handlung.

Durch Wortauslassung (z.B. des Verbes) erzielt Wessel eine mit der Zäsur zusammenwirkende Gefühlssteigerung. In Strophe 1: "Die Fahne hoch!" In 2: "Die Straße frei" (zweimal). Der Übergang vom Satz zum Befehl liegt schon in der Syntax. In diesem Kommandomilieu, die Außenwelt widerspiegelnd, erscheint dann "S.A. marschiert" vor einer Zäsur, und auch hier könnte man den Imperativ heraushören. In der dritten Strophe sind Befehl nicht mehr nötig, und der durch Gefühl und Emotion vom Herzen ausgestoßene Endsatz will die persönliche Hingabe und Glaubensstärke deutlich machen.

Klangmusikalität und -malerei sind nicht nur häufig anzutreffen, sondern, was man von Alliteration und Parallelismus auch behaupten dürfte, kommen dort vor, wo sie die größte dichterische Wirkung ausüben. Die erste Strophe ist dann nicht allein von der lautlich harten Alliteration auffallend:

Reihen
***R**otfront* ***R**eaktion*
Reihen

Hier kommt auch ein beifälliges Element konkreter Dichtung vor. Sind die "Reihen" tatsächlich den Feinden in die Flanken gefallen? Das war der Zweck der SA schlechthin.

Die Klangmalerei in jeder dritten Zeile ist nicht zu übersehen (überhören). In der ersten Strophe rollen, mahlen, dröhnen die R-Laute: "Kam'raden, Rotfront, Reaktion, erschossen.' In der zweiten Strophe - nebenbei die aktivste Stelle im Gedicht überhaupt - ist in der dritten Zeile die Stelle, worin der Dichter uns seinen Grund für Optimismus durch S-, H- und O-Laute erklärt: "Es schaun aufs Hakenkreuz voll Hoffnung schon Millionen." In der letzten Strophe herrschen in der entsprechenden Zeile wieder bestimmte Laute, diesmal die L, F und die Vokalsymetrie der A: "Bald flattern Hitlerfahnen über allen Straßen."

Innerhalb der schlichten Handlung entfalten sich im Verlauf des Gedichts mehr oder weniger kreisläufige Motive. Als Kampfzyklus erscheint: "Fahne hoch - Straße frei - Appell." Der SA-Mann selbst erlebt "erschossene Kameraden - überlebend holt einer das Hakendreuz - Blick in die Zukunft." In einem ähnlichen Zyklus entwickelt sich die Fahne selbst, das am schärfsten geprägte Sinnbild im Gedicht. Von einer einfachen Fahne, ohne nähere Beschreibung, wird sie in der zweiten Strophe zum Hakenkreuzträger. Diese Fahne ist mit dem Parteisymbol versehen, aber so sieht ja jede SA Gruppenstandarte und jeder Gauwimpel aus. Erst in der dritten Strophe ist es uns klar, daß es sich absolut um die Fahne der NSDAP, also die Hitlerfahne handelt. Diese ist für

den Dichter die Fahne schlechthin. Der Zuhörer kann sie förmlich hissen hören.

Personifizierung unterstützt den Werdegang des Gedichts, indem die belebteste Lage - etwa die erste Hälfte - die meiste Personifizierung aufweist: SA marschiert, Rotfront und Reaktion erschießen, Geister marschieren, das Hakenkreuz bietet. Das alles beruhigt sich aber in der zweiten Hältfe, worin die Dinge eher ihre eigentlichen Merkmale aufweisen: der Tag bricht an, die Fahne flattert; nach dem Sieg der NSDAP wird die Welt also ihren normalen Lauf nehmen.

Die Herkunft der Musik bleibt bis heute leider noch im Unklaren. Als "Die Fahne hoch!" erschien, fehlte jeder Hinweis auf eine dazugehörige Melodie. Aber binnen weniger Monate wurde es das große Propagandalied schlechthin, und kurz danach die zweite Nationalhymne. Goebbels und die ersten Biographien behaupteten, was jedoch m.E. zu bezweifeln ist, daß das Gedicht vom Verfasser selbst vertont wurde. Die Herkunft der Melodie ist allenfalls umstritten. War sie eine Hamburger Gassenhauer, eine weniger bekannte Wiener Weise, oder entstammte sie sogar einem kommunistischen Gesangbuch?[11] Eine Behauptung hält sie für eine Melodie aus der Oper *Joseph*, obwohl dieser Forscher sie unter den Waisen jener freilich kaum bekannten Oper nicht enthüllen konnte. Wie dem auch sei, die Melodie gehört seit 1930 unzertrennlich zum *Horst-Wessel-Lied*, das zum Singen und zum Marschieren bestimmt worden war. Durch Zäsur und musikalische Pausen erreicht es einen fast synkopierten Rhythmus und einen hohen Schwung. Der Takt bietet darüber hinaus klänglich weichere Möglichkeiten, die die Hervorhebung des Gesungenen ermöglichen. Also läßt sich das *Horst-Wessel-Lied* leicht von einem Marschlied in eine Hymne umarrangieren.

Metrisch besteht das Musikalische aus vier Phrasen, den Gedichtszeilen entsprechend, von jeweils 16 Takten. Jede Phrase fließt durch den Auftakt in die nächste hinüber. Dadurch erscheinen die Gedichtszeilen, die von der Silbenzahl und den Hebungen her gesehen etwas uneben sind, in einer schier rechteckigen Form. Die kürzeren Zeilen dehnen sich durch Paukenschläge (Zäsur) aus, um den taktmäßig etwas weiteren Raum auszufüllen. Die dritte Zeile wird weniger forciert und wirkt dadurch erzählerischer, da in ihr die Zahl der Silben am ehesten die der Takte erreicht.

Selbst die Noten aber verraten einige anzunehmende Ziele des Dichters. Die Musik ist stark der Tradition der Militärmusik verpflichtet, was mit dem Texte völlig übereinstimmt. Und da der Höhenunterschied der Noten nur eine Stufe über eine Oktave beträgt, ist das *Horst-Wessel-Lied* besonders gut zum Singen geeignet. Die sinkenden Töne am Anfang ("Die Fahne hoch!") sind aber merkwürdig, da bei weitem die meisten Lieder steigend beginnen. Hier steht eine Abstufung der ersten Noten in grellem Kontrast zu dem Emporheben der Fahne, im Hörer bzw. Sänger eine kreative Spannung bildend. Hier strebt die Fahne gegen den Widerstand.

Innerhalb einer Strophe stehen die niedrigeren, dunkleren Noten in der ersten Hälfte den helleren, höheren Noten der zweiten Hälfte gegenüber. Am Ende der dritten Phrase befindet sich der höchste Ton im Lied überhaupt, was völlig dem etwas erhabeneren Sinn jener Gedichtszeile entspricht. Am Ende der vierten Phrase (z.B. "nur noch kurze Zeit") sind sogar alle Töne höher als der Anfang, und das Lied endet, auf

den höherliegenden Grundton ansteigend. Darin spiegelt sich im Klang der Gedanke, daß der Sieg und die helle Zukunft aufwärts führen.

Das *Horst-Wessel-Lied* war also weit mehr als Gelegenheitsdichtung, mehr als ein Gedicht für den Alltag, mehr als ein Gemeinschafts- oder Marschlied. Es läßt sich auch nicht ohne Widerstand in die Gruppierungen von Bekenntnis-, Agitationsliedern oder Gebrauchsliteratur zwingen. Das *Horst-Wessel-Lied* verdeutlicht eine Lage, bejaht Handlung, deutet auf eine Lösung hin, und endet - persönliche Verpflichtung und Glauben hervorrufend - mit einem Versprechen für die Zukunft. Das Lied ist Lyrik, die Bekenntnis aussprechen, Sänger sowie Zuhörer bewegen, ja sogar Hymne werden will. In der Melodie wie auch im Wortlaut liegen unverkennbar Zeugnisse künstlerischer Verflechtung und überlegten Aufbaus, wodurch das *Horst-Wessel-Lied* sich literarisch als ein dichterisches Bruchstück der deutschen Literatur erweist. Zur Behauptung, eine wohlüberlegte Einstellung zum *Horst-Wessel-Lied* sei ein Schritt zur Vergangenheitsaufarbeitung, mag Johann Gottfried Herder hier als Kronzeuge dienen: "Ich will nichts weniger als die ... verteidigen, nur erklären möchte ich sie: wie in allem doch Geist hauchet!"

ANMERKUNGEN

1. Herman Wouk, *War and Remembrance* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1978), S. 981.

2. Ausdruck von Günter Grass, *ortlich betaubt*.

3. Uwe-K. Ketelsen, Nationalsozialismus und Drittes Reich," in *Geschichte der politischen Lyrik in Deutschland*, Hrsg. Walter Hinderer (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1978), S. 291f.

4. Vgl. Josef Wulf, *Literatur und Dichtung im Dritten Reich* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1963); auch Paul Fechter, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1960).

5. Helmut Heiber, *Goebbels* (NY: Hawthorn, 1972), S. 68f.

6. Vgl. Hanns Heinz Ewers, *Horst Wessel - Ein deutsches Schicksal* (1932); Ingeborg Wessel, *Horst Wessel* (1933); auch Erwin Reitmann, *Horst Wessel, Leben und Sterben* (1933).

7. Alexander von Bormann, "Das nationalsozialistische Gemeinschaftslied," in *Die deutsche Literatur im Dritten Reich*, Hrsg. Horst Denkler und Karl Prümm, (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1976), S. 259f.

8. Ketelsen, S. 293f.

9. Franz Schonauer, *Deutsche Literatur im Dritten Reich* (Olten: Walter, 1961), S. 107.

10. Nach der Machergreifung wird in Zeile 11, z.B., "bald" zu "schon."

11. Herkunft der Melodie ist, unter anderen Erklärungen, vom Autor selbst (William Schirer), aus anderen Nationalhymnen (Robert Payne), von einem Hamburger Gassenhauer (Paul Nettl), Wiener Ursprungs (John Tolland), einem kommunistischen Liederbuch (Helmut Heiber) oder einer französischen Oper entnommen (*Der Spiegel*).